

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1848.

CASH TERMS FOR ADVERTISEMENTS

Captain Christopher Gwathin, com-
 mander. Nearly full cargo being engaged and
 ready for shipment, this vessel will have im-
 mediate dispatch. The cabin accommodations
 are very superior.
 For freight or passage apply to Captain
 Gwathin; or to
 JOSEPH S. WILLIS,

FOR Freight or Charter,
the first-class British ship
LAWRENCE,
276 tons register, Robert Sal-
mon, commander. Apply to the Captain, on
board; or to
BROWN AND CO.,
472, George-street.

together with applications for Booths, directed under cover to the Secretary, will be received on Wednesday, the 13th December, between the hours of 3 and 4 o'clock P.M., at Mr. Ostley's, the "Sportsman's Arms," Pitt-street South.

All dogs found on the course will be destroyed.

FREDERICK ARMAND.

Union will take place a few days after, notice of which will be given by advertisement.
The list being nearly full, an early application is necessary from those who may wish to subscribe.
Prospectuses may be obtained on application to
W. AND F. FORD,
Artists' Engravers.

Mr. S. will furthermore undertake the purchase of supplies at the lowest market rate and also to make cash advances thereon necessary.

MR. SAMUEL LYONS,
George street and Charlotte-place

FOR SALE, Dantzic Yellow Pine
Planks, sixteen to eighteen feet long
three to one inch thick, and eleven inch
broad. Apply immediately to Captain
McDonnell, at the Custom House.

Furniture dimity
Huckabacks, diapers, &c.
Rich black and coloured satins
Rich striped duces, &c. of the newest styles

A small quantity of very superior South Sea
Island **AKROWROOT**, in 2, 6, and 10
packages.

This image shows a vertical strip of a document page. The left side features a dark, textured binding edge, likely made of wood or a similar material. The right side is a lighter, possibly blank or heavily faded page area. The overall appearance is that of an old, worn document.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1848.

**SPEECH OF SIR WM. MOLESWORTH
IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, JULY
25, 1848.**

a speaking of colonies. I do not intend to include under that term the territories which are under the direct administration of the Crown. I shall confine my remarks to those foreign possessions of the Crown which are under the jurisdiction of the Colonial Office. Notwithstanding this limitation, the colonial empire of Great Britain and Ireland comprises an area of millions of square miles, an area equal to the whole of Europe and British India added together; of this vast space about one million of square miles have been divided into forty different colonies, each with its own government; four of them are in Europe, five in North America, fifteen in the West Indies, three in South America, five in Africa and its dependencies, two in Asia, and five in Australia and New Zealand. (Hear, hear, hear.) The population of these colonies does not exceed five million of persons; this number about 2,600,000 are of European origin, the remainder being of Dutch or Spanish, and the remainder, amounting to about 1,600,000, are of English, Irish, or Scotch origin. Of the 2,600,000 inhabitants of the colonies who are of European origin, about 1,400,000 are Cinghese and other inhabitants of Ceylon, and 1,100,000 are of African origin. (Hear, hear.) In 1844 (the last complete return) the value of the British produce and manufactures exported to the colonies amounted to about nine millions sterling. The whole colonial expenditure of the British empire is about eight millions sterling, of which the military expenditure by the colonies and one-half by Great Britain. That portion of the colonial expenditure which is defrayed by Great Britain consists of military, naval, civil, and extraordinary expenditure. The military expenditure of the colonies by Great Britain on account of the colonies (including ordnance and commissariat expenditure) was referred to Parliament for the year 1844 at £1,781,606, for the year 1845 at £2,930,050, and for the year 1846 at £2,930,050; for 1847-48 (the latest return) at £2,556,919, an increase between 1842 and 1843 of £795,414. The present military expenditure is probably about the same as in 1846-47, and the present military expenditure of the colonies amounts at present to about 12,000 men (exclusive of artillery and engineers), or to about three-eighths of the whole military force of the British empire (exclusive of the army and the Royal Navy). The total amount of force we shall have to vote this year, first, in the army estimates, for the pay, clothing, &c., of 42,000 men, and for the foreign service, £1,500,000; secondly, in the ordnance estimates for the ordnance officers and engineers (which I will suppose to be the same as in 1843-4) for ordnance establishments, barracks, fortifications, and stores, in the commissariat estimates, and, thirdly, in the commissariat estimates for commissariat services, provisions, forage, fuel, light, &c., in the colonies about £430,000; in all, about £2,500,000, which will be the direct military expenditure of the colonies. To form a fair estimate of the whole military expenditure by Great Britain on account of the colonies for one year, it would be necessary to add to this the cost of the commissariat and ordnance on account of reliefs, military establishments at home, and other matters, which are in part required in order to keep up so large a military force. It is evident, therefore, that I shall under estimate the military expenditure by Great Britain on account of the colonies when I set it down at only £2,600,000 a year (hear). Secondly, with regard to the naval expenditure, the colonies are the basis of the colonies. At present we have about 238 ships in commission, with a complement not much short of 40,000 men. Of these ships 153 are a complement of about 25,000 men each, and four of them are in the Mediterranean, some on the North American and West Indian station, some off the West Coast of Africa and the Cape of Good Hope, others in the Chinese and Indian seas, or protecting our interests in the Pacific. (Hear, hear, hear.) Now the house will remember that in every debate that has taken place this year on the estimates, the extent of the naval force of the colonies which are springing up in Australia, New Zealand, and the Chinese and Indian seas, were among the chief causes assigned by the Government for the increase of the naval force of Great Britain, and for the increase of that force, which has doubled both in the last ten years and during the last thirteen or fourteen years. If I may be allowed to say so, without exaggeration, assume that at least one-third of the ships on foreign stations—

which they would compel us, contrary to every sound principle of war, to employ our force instead of concentrating our forces. (Hear, hear, hear.) Therefore, in the event of a really serious struggle, they would, like other outposts, in all probability, be abandoned to the enemy, and at least £300,000 would have to be retained possession of them as long as we have the dominion of the seas, but having no dominion of the seas, I cannot see why we should cover all of them with fortified stations and armed troops. It may therefore believe a wiser generation will hold wiser opinions with regard to the utility of these possessions. I will, however, for the present suppose that it will them, for the purpose of the country, and proceed to tell the hon. member what they cost us (hear, hear). First, Gibraltar and Malta: in 1843-4 the total expenditure incurred by Great Britain on account of their stationing and of £360,000 per year, which was about the same sum every year, for the garrisons consist of between 5000 and 6000 men (exclusive of artillery and engineers), and considerable sums are annually expended on fortifications and military works. As it is stated in the navy and ordnance estimates of this year, that the work now in progress in these two colonies will cost us £460,000 (hear, hear.) I will not add to this the cost of the expense of transporting them. But I do question the utility of protecting the Ionian Islands with 2300 troops at a cost to this country of about £130,000 a year, which is somewhat more than the defence of the coast of Spain costs France. In 1844, When England first became the protecting sovereign of the Ionian States, it was on the express condition that a portion, at least, of the military expense should be borne by the States themselves. The amount was subsequently fixed at £35,000 a year (hear, hear). In 1842, the Ionian States were £172,000 in arrears, and I believe they arranged to pay off the arrears in three years, and spent large sums on military works at Corfu and a grant of £17,873 is to be proposed this year to complete some of these works. Therefore our military stations in the Mediterranean represent a standing charge of £297,000, or nearly half a million a year, exclusively of an portion of the expense of the fleet in the Mediterranean. That fleet, on the average of the last five years, has consisted of twenty-three ships, ordered from abroad, and the expense of which, for wages, victuals, wear and tear, may be reckoned at half a million a year. The declared value of our exports to those states is £1,000,000 a year, and the value of our imports as a smuggling trade through Gibraltar into Spain (hear, hear). I next proceed to the Bermudas. Since the peace we have expended there upwards of £600,000, in naval stores, ordnance, &c., and I am strongly estimated that to complete these works a further sum of £280,000 will be required. As the Bermudas there is a garrison of 1200 men at a cost (exclusive of the expense for food and clothing) of £120,000 a year. Now what is the use of such costly establishments and fortifications on these worthless rocks? It is said that the Bermudas are useful as a means of aggression against the United States; but I can find no evidence to confirm this statement. Let the United States should take possession of them, I do not believe the United States would. The object of the establishment is a gift to the States, which are chiefly used as comfortable residence for the admiral on the North American station, for whom it is proposed to build a house at a cost of about £18,000. I next proceed to Mauritius, where we have expended already upwards of £40,000 a year, and to the colonies on the western coast of Africa, which in a similar manner cost us about £52,000 a year. These colonies are not, strictly speaking, of much importance; but they are of much commercial importance; their maintenance is to impede the slave trade. The fleet which we had last year upon this station, consisted of 21 ships, with 250 guns, and a complement of 2731 men, and cost £1,000,000. To Parliament for wages, victuals of crews, and wear and tear of ships, at £301,628 a year. Besides these ships, we generally expend about £100,000 a year on other matters connected with what we called the slave trade, and the slave trade. (Hear, hear.) Therefore, at least, half a million a year is the direct expenditure by Great Britain in the vain attempt to put a stop to the African slave trade, and I think that all this under the head of colonial expenditure is needless, but, nevertheless, I may be permitted to express my belief that it is a most useless expenditure, and to recommend Parliament to abandon it. I have now to mention the Cape of Good Hope, Loane, and the other stations on the west coast of Africa, and thus to save the country an outlay of at least £450,000 a year. I now arrive at the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope (the area of which is 100,000 square miles, and the population of the United Kingdom.) It may be looked upon as a commercial colony as well as a military station. As a commercial colony, it is not so important as the Cape of Good Hope, the declared value of our exports to it was £250,000, and our imports from it were £258,000. This difference was made up by the military expenditure of Great Britain, which for 1843-1844 amounted to £100,000, or 40 per cent on our exports. In that year, the number of troops in the colony was 2951 rank and file (one time); last year the number was one time 5477 rank and file. The number of troops in consequence of the Crimean war, and for the same reason the fleet on this station was increased to nine ships, with a complement of 1700 men, the number of troops in the Cape of Good Hope at the rate of £120,000 a year.

paid £1,000, and, in all probability £800,000 or £900,000 more will be required to liquidate this account. The House will not be astonished at this expenditure, when it is informed, in the words of Sir Harry Smith, "that called the Band did of a brush with a Kafir chief called Sallidi, who was killed by our men, and he was alone." One word with regard to that war, for it is a most striking instance of the pranks that colonial governors can play, of the little control that a Secretary of State for the Colonies can exercise over his Governors, and of the manner in which this country is perpetually liable under the present colonial system, of having vast sums of money expended upon a worthless colony. The Duke of Good Hope is the Anglo-South African War, which was so justly terminated was, I believe, the fourth in the last thirty years. The one which preceded it is said to have cost this country half a million sterling. All these wars have originated from nearly as senseless causes, namely cattle stealing along a frontier of upwards of seven hundred miles. Sometimes the Kafirs stole or were accused of stealing, the cattle of the colonists; sometimes they shot them; then they came to blows, and bloodshed ensued. Colonial government interfered; a large expenditure of public money ensued, to be paid for out of the Imperial treasury. (Hear, hear.) And the result was, after the usual process to the origin of that war, there a great difference of opinion. Some persons, apparently with great reason, ascribe it to the discontinuance of the system of Sir B. D'Urban, and the introduction of the system of the missionaries; and they maintain that the cause was inevitable, and only too long delayed by attempts to conciliate the Kafirs. Other persons, with much show of reason, ascribe its origin and its continuance to the fact that the Governor, Sir P. Maitland. However this may be, the immediate cause of the war was this: A Kafir on the frontier stole an axe. He was arrested and sent off to prison. On the other side, a Kafir stole a cow. Bloodshed ensued—on the one side a Kafir, on the other a Hottentot constable was slain, and the prisoner was rescued. Application was then made to the Government for redress of the offenders. They refused to give up the offenders, and the Government, who are the colonial authorities were not satisfied by treaty to send a Kafir to prison for such a trifle as stealing an axe, and that the blood of the Hottentot constable should be shed. The Governor took first killed, and they entered into a quarrel. The Governor not to be in haste with forces, but to have a talk about the matter and try to understand it. However, the Governor at once called in the troops, and the war commenced. The land was invaded; but every arrangement was so ill made that our troops were repulsed, their baggage-waggons were cut off; and the victorious Kafirs, in their turn, invaded the British territory. Our troops followed them lived in the bush, enduring (according to his own account) unending hardships, when he was very properly expelled. Great was the amazement of the British people, and Sir Henry Pottinger, at the state of affairs, which he discovered in the colony. He declares that he cannot give an "adequate idea of the confusion, unauthorized expense, and loss of time, and bloodshed, and trouble, which had obtained." In that peccation, he mourned that men of high station were implicated. Numerous instances of reckless expenditure are stated in Sir Henry's despatches. One day, for example, on the Orange River, where few inhabitants were, on the plea of defending the frontier, receiving rations at the rate of £21,000 a year. (Hear, hear.) Another, in the vicinity of a station called Brits Drivens, where no Europeans regularly go to a number of Kafirs, who had been fighting against us. Sir Henry attempted to put a stop to those abuses: and the war was being to end to a close. But unfortunately circumstances occurred which lost. They were tracked across the frontier into the territory of a Kafir chief; he was required to restore them, and to give up the offenders. The Government, however, immediately sent back, but the Government, knowledge of the other two, and of the thief, if there were one. Sir H. Pottinger was not satisfied. He ordered a secret expedition into the interior, and the war was continued. The expedition, as usual, failed—the chief escaped—the troops retreated, after having killed a few Kafirs, and carried off some head of cattle, and the war was kindled afresh. This time, however, the Government acted by a divided command, and the greater portion of his troops were unsuitable for the service which they had to perform (hear, hear). For similar reasons, the Boers, accustomed to regular warfare, were not fit for displaying their strategic skill in a contest with savages (hear, hear, hear)—heavy dragoons mounted upon chargers, armed with fixed bayonets, and equipped with accoutrements, English regiments, with their ordnance, horse-artillery and accoutrements, had, under the burning sun of Africa, to attack Kafirs skulking in the bush all but impenetrable to Europeans (hear, hear, hear). The Boers, however, regiments, with artillery and engineers, were not a match for half the number of naked savages armed with assegais (hear, hear). The war could never have been brought to a close, had it not been for the intervention of the Government. It proceeded of Hottentots, led on by brave and energetic young English officers, followed the sporadic Kafirs, captured their cattle, and brought them back like sheep. By these means Sir H. Pottinger brought the war to a close just as he was succeeded by Sir H. Smith. Sir H. Smith, in addition to other marvellous feats, has made the Kafir chiefs like his foot soldiers.

1. The first part of the document is a list of the names of the members of the committee, followed by a list of the names of the members of the sub-committee.

I should propose to reduce that force to 10,000 men, whereof 4000 would be sufficient for North America, 5000 for the West Indies, and 5000 for Australia; and then, in my opinion, less than £1,000,000 a year would suffice to defray the expenses of those colonies to Great Britain. Therefore the whole reduction which I should propose at present to make in that portion of the colonial expenditure which is defrayed by Great Britain is £2,000,000 a year. I should effect that saving partly by a reduction of 25,000 men in the military force in the colonies, partly by a reduction of the naval and civil expenditure on account of the colonies; and partly by removing the causes which have led to the Canadian rebellions, Kafir and New Zealand wars, and the like. If this were accomplished, still, however, the colonies would continue to cost the large sum of £2,000,000 a year; but I believe that a further reduction might ultimately be made on account of the commercial colonies; indeed they might cost us next to nothing if we gave them complete control over their own affairs, on condition that they should pay their own expenses (hear, hear). The military stations, however, must always be a source of great expense and if we retain them we must be content to pay for them out of our pockets. Before I leave this subject I must call the attention of the house to a Treasury minute of the 10th June last, in which my Lords complain of the delay in rendering, and especially in auditing colonial accounts (hear, hear). My Lords instance those from Ceylon, the Mauritius, the Falkland Islands, Van Diemen's Land, and New South Wales, and the commissariat accounts from China, the Cape of Good Hope, Van Diemen's and New South Wales, to which I will add those from St. Lucia, South Australia, and Western Australia. My Lords state that these accounts are so much in arrears that they cannot admit the sufficiency of the reasons assigned for that delay (hear, hear). The delay has certainly been very extraordinary. I find that there are at present in the Audit Office the unaudited accounts of ten years from the Mauritius (hear, hear), of eight years from the Cape of Good Hope (hear, hear), of six years from Ceylon (hear, hear), and of four or five years from the other colonies to which I have referred (hear, hear, hear). It is evident that with such delay it is impossible to exercise an effectual check over colonial expenditure. I shall now proceed to the consideration of that portion of the colonial expenditure of the British empire which is defrayed by the colonies themselves. A return has just been presented to the house of that expenditure for the last year in which it could be made up. In most instances it is for the year 1845; it is not materially different from the returns for previous years; I may, therefore, without any considerable inaccuracy, assume that it represents the ordinary annual expenditure of the colonies, and especially for the year 1845. From that return, it appears that the total expenditure by all the colonies (excepting Ceylon and the stations on the west coast of Africa, for reasons which I will presently state, and likewise the Ionian Islands, from which there was no return) was £2,850,000. In 1845 the population of these colonies was about 2,400,000; therefore the annual expenditure was at the rate of 19s. 4d. per head of the population. The rate of expenditure, however, varies considerably in different colonies, according to the form of local government. It is greater or less, according as the colonies have more or less of a representative assembly which have, and those which have not representative assemblies. From that comparison I have omitted Ceylon, because Ceylon is not a colony properly so called, but belongs to the class of Indian possessions, and it is evident that a rate of expenditure which might be considered trifling for a population composed chiefly of Europeans might be excessive for a population of the Congolese and Yiddahs of Ceylon. I have likewise omitted the colonies on the west coast of Africa, for there is no account of their population on which any reliance can be placed; and the Ionian Islands have also been omitted, because, as I have already said, their expenditure has not been returned to Parliament in the return in question. With these omissions, I find that the rate of expenditure of the colonies with representative assemblies is less than one-half of the rate of the expenditure of the colonies without representative assemblies. The colonies with representative assemblies have a population of about five millions five hundred and eighty thousand, and their expenditure in 1845 was £1,930,000, or at the rate of 14s. 11d. per head of their population. On the other hand, the population of the colonies without representative assemblies, was about 820,000, and their expenditure in 1845 was £1,420,000, or at the rate of £1 14s. a head for their population, or 18s. 7d. a head more than in the colonies with representative assemblies. I am convinced that this great increase of the rate of expenditure in the Crown colonies is mainly to be attributed to the want of self-government (hear, hear), in it is most apparent when the rate of expenditure in each class of colonies is examined and considered separately. For instance the rate of expenditure is the lowest in the North American colonies, where there is the greatest amount of self-government; in fact, since the last insurrection in Canada, and in the establishment of the doctrine of responsible government, Canada has become in most respects an independent state, except as far as the British flag is concerned, and except that it is then subjected to some mischievous and foolish interference on the part of the Colonial Office. Now, the expenditure of the North American colonies in 1845 was £1,700,000, their population was 1,700,000, therefore the rate of expenditure was 13s. 4d. per head of the population, or 1s. 7d. less than the average rate of the colonies with representative assemblies (hear, hear). But it should be remarked, that of the £1,700,000 expenditure of the North American colonies, £1,100,000 was an extraordinary expenditure by Canada, on account of new works and buildings, a large portion of which was defrayed by a loan. If a portion of this loan were repaid, so that it ought to be, from the annual revenue, then the rate of expenditure by

the North American colonies for the year 1845 would have been nearly the same as it was for the year 1842, when it amounted to about 9s. a head of the population (hear, hear). Though this rate of expenditure is low as compared to our other colonies, yet it is about thirty per cent. higher than that of the United States for similar purposes. The difference mainly arises from the high scale of salaries paid to the higher functionaries in the North American colonies. Generally speaking, those functionaries receive from three to four times the amount of the salaries of similar functionaries in the United States. For instance, in the Canadas, with a population of 1,200,000 the governor is paid £7000 a year. In the United States the president has only £5000 a year. (Hear, hear.) There is no governor who has more than £1200 a year; and in the state of New York, with a population of 2,600,000, the governor only receives £800 a year. Again, the chief justices of Upper and Lower Canada are paid £1500 a year each, while the chancellor and chief justices of the state of New York receive only £800 a year each. The puisne judges of Canada receive £1000 a year each; those of New York only £200 a year each. The governor of Nova Scotia is paid £2500 a year, the governors of New Brunswick and Newfoundland are paid £3000 a year each. In Massachusetts, with a population much larger than that of the three last colonies added together, the salary of the governor is only £500 a year. In fact, the four North American colonies, which I have just mentioned, pay £2500 a year more for the salaries of their four governors than the thirty states of the union do for their thirty governors. Now in the colonies the salaries are fixed by the various civil lists. These civil lists being removed for a series of years from the control of the representative assemblies, are perpetual causes of quarrelling and discontent (hear, hear), and there is always a dispute going on between the Colonial Office and some colony which ultimately leads to the insurrection in that colony. (Hear, hear.) And at present the Colonial Office is involved in a civil list quarrel with British Guiana. In all these quarrels the object of the office is to keep up the pay of its functionaries, and the object of the colonists is a reduction of expenditure. There can be no doubt that the salaries of the higher functionaries in the colonies are excessive as compared to the standard of the United States, which is the usual standard of comparison in the colonies. For the salaries of the governors of the thirty states of the Union amount in all to but £14,000 a year. Therefore the average is £450 a year for the salary of each governor. Now, there are eighteen British colonies which pay for their own governors—their salaries amount in all to £75,000 a year—therefore the average is £4100 a year for the salary of each of these governors, or nearly nine times the rate of pay in the United States. In fact, nine out of the eighteen governors in question receive as much as, or more than the President of the United States (hear, hear). For instance, the governors of Canada, the Mauritius, and Ceylon, receive £7000 a year each; the governor of Jamaica has £6500 a year; and the governors of Gibraltar, Malta, the Ionian Islands, the Cape of Good Hope, and New South Wales, have £5500 a year each. I do not think this rate of pay is too high for noble lords and other gentlemen of rank and connection, when they undertake the duties of governors of the colonies. But if we are determined to employ such persons in the colonies, we ought to pay for them as we should permit the colonies to elect their own governors and other functionaries, and to pay them what salaries they think fit. Such was in olden times the constitution of our colonies of Rhode Island, Connecticut, and Massachusetts. And the honor and distinction attached to the office of Governor would induce the best men in the colonies to serve for moderate salaries. If, however, the colonies were to choose, in any particular case, an unfit man to be a governor, they would be the sufferers; they would have no one but themselves to blame; but, as I will presently show, it would be difficult for them to make a worse choice than the Colonial Office generally makes (cheers). To return to the question of the comparative rate of expenditure in those colonies which have and those colonies which have not representative governments. In the West Indies the colonies with representative assemblies are the Antigua, the Leeward Islands, the Windward Islands, with the exception of St. Lucia and the Bahamas. Their population is about 700,000, their expense, in 1845 was £450,000 or at the rate of 12s. 10d. per head of their population; the rate of Jamaica was 12s. Now compare this rate with that of the West Indian colonies without representative assemblies, namely, St. Lucia, Honduras, Trinidad, and British Guiana (the legislature of which cannot with any propriety be termed a representative assembly); their population is about 190,000; their expenditure, exclusive of the cost of immigration, was £281,000 or at the rate of £1 9s. a head, or more than twice as much as that of the West Indian colonies which have representative governments. The salaries of the higher functionaries in the West Indian colonies are also excessive, as compared with the standard of the United States. Twelve governors and lieutenant-governors receive £29,000 a year, £16,000 of which are paid by the colonists to five governors. (Hear, hear.) As I have already observed, the Colonial Office is involved in a civil list dispute with British Guiana. In consequence of the distressed condition of that colony, at the close of last year the elective members of the Court of Policy proposed a reduction of twenty-five per cent. upon all salaries above £700 a year. The Colonial Office refused to accede to this proposal; and the governor carried the estimates for the year in the Court of Policy by the exercise of his double vote. The combined court then refused to vote the supplies for the period required by the governor. The Colonial Office has retaliated upon them for this conduct by stopping immigration to British

Guiana, and by refusing the usual licenses to carry liberated negroes from Sierra Leone to that colony. This unexpected proceeding has occasioned considerable inconvenience and loss to various shipowners in this country, who complain that no reliance can be placed upon the Colonial Office with its perpetually shifting regulations. (Hear, hear.) The Cape of Good Hope and the Mauritius have each of them about the same population—namely, 160,000—and being Crown colonies, their rate of expenditure is about the same as that of the Crown colonies of the West Indies, namely, £1 7s. a head; they are grievously taxed, especially the Mauritius. As I have already said, the Governor of the Mauritius has £7000 a year, and the Governor of the Cape has as much as the President of the United States. It may be said that the rate of expenditure is higher in the Crown colonies, because, generally speaking, those colonies are more thinly peopled than the colonies with representative assemblies. It is perfectly true, that everything else being the same, the rate of expenditure in a thinly peopled territory will generally exceed that of a thickly peopled one. But the Crown colony of the Mauritius is four times as densely peopled as Jamaica, yet the rate of expenditure in Jamaica per head of the population, is less than one-half what it is in the Mauritius. (Hear, hear.) Again, the Crown colony of Malta is one of the most densely peopled spots on the face of the earth, yet the rate of expenditure is 16s. 6d. a head of the population, or twenty per cent. more than that of the plantations in the West Indies; or nearly double the ordinary rate of expenditure in the thinly peopled North American colonies. Again, Malta is more than twice as thickly peopled as the Ionian States, but these states have a certain amount of self-government, and their rate of expenditure in 1840 (the last return which I have been able to get at) was 14s. 8d. a head, 3d. a head less than that of Malta. Ceylon is the only apparent exception to the rule, that the rate of expenditure of colonies governed by the Colonial Office is greater than that of the self-governed colonies. According to Sir Eardly Wilmot, the population of Ceylon in 1846 must have amounted to 500,000, and the expenditure in that year was £498,000, or at the rate of 9s. 7d. a head of the population. It is true this rate of expenditure is lower than that of any other colony, yet I believe it will be found to be extravagant when the nature of the population is considered. For it ought to be compared with that of the territories governed by the East India Company, which are inhabited by an analogous population, but are locally governed by men carefully selected on account of their special aptitude. The population of these territories is said to be about 95,000,000, and the expenditure on the average of the five years ending 1844 was £20,000,000 sterling, therefore, at the rate of 4s. 3d. a head of the population, or one-third less than that of Ceylon. It can be no doubt that if Ceylon were transferred, as I propose, to the East India Company, it would be more economically governed than it is by the Colonial Office. Lastly, with regard to the Australian colonies, New South Wales is the only one which has a representative assembly of any kind. It commenced its existence in 1843, and immediately caused an extraordinary diminution of its expenditure. In 1841 the free population of New South Wales amounted to about 102,000, and the ordinary expenditure, exclusive of immigration, was £300,000, or at the enormous rate of £3 4s. a head of the population. In 1843 the Representative Assembly at once diminished the expenditure for the subsequent year by £60,000; and in 1846, when the free population of the colony was 170,000, the expenditure was only £254,000, or at the rate of £1 8s. a head of the population. (Hear, hear.) This extraordinary reduction in the rate of expenditure may be attributed to a certain extent to immigration, but the reduction in the positive amount of expenditure can be distinctly traced to the commencement of local self-government in 1843. (Hear, hear.) Now compare the rate of expenditure of New South Wales with that of the neighbouring colony Van Diemen's Land, which has in vain petitioned for a representative assembly. In 1842 the free population of that colony amounted to 37,000, and on the average of the four years ending with 1844, the expenditure, exclusive of immigration, was £161,000, or at the enormous rate of £4 4s. a head. This rate of expenditure was not very different from that of the kindred colony of New South Wales prior to the establishment of representative government; but it is more than three times that of New South Wales after the establishment of representative government. Unfortunately, however, he acknowledged that the difference in the rate of expenditure of the two colonies may be attributed in part, though certainly not altogether, to the abolition of transportation in New South Wales, and to its continuance in its worst form in Van Diemen's Land (hear, hear). The house may remember the appalling description which was given last year of the loathsome moral state of the convict population of that colony, and its dependency, Norfolk Island; of the hideous crimes—of their frightful diseases—and of their atrocious murders. It was said that the unhappy state of the colony was brought about partly by the negligence of the then Secretary of State for the Colonies, Lord Stanley; partly by the mismanagement of the then Governor of Van Diemen's Land, Sir Eardly Wilmot; and partly by the misconduct of the then commandant of Norfolk Island, Major Childs. In consequence of these horrid disclosures, it was announced last year that the Governor of Van Diemen's Land, Sir W. Denison, that it was the intention of the Government that transportation should be discontinued altogether, and an announcement was received with great satisfaction in the colony. Unfortunately, it now appears that transportation is to be renewed to Van Diemen's Land, though in a mitigated form (hear, hear). The colonists will be bitterly disappointed, and exasperated when they receive this information. At present they are discontented; for, to meet the vast expenditure of the estimates for the year in the Court of Policy, the judges have pronounced to be illegal; and one of the judges so deciding has been removed by the governor, as the colonists believe, in consequence of his decision—a belief which, from the statements made to the house by the

honourable gentleman the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, appears to be unfounded. The colonists, however, will have every reason to be dissatisfied with the renewal of transportation, which will mar their prospects and make them for ever the plague and reproach of Australasia. In the other Australian colonies which have not representative governments, I am unable to state with accuracy the rate of expenditure per head of the population. In South Australia, at one time, it exceeded £10 a head per annum; and the colony became utterly bankrupt through the extravagance of its governor, Governor Gawler. We had to liquidate its debts, partly by a gift in 1842 to the amount of £214,936, and by a loan of £85,000. This loan will be repaid, because South Australia is becoming rich in consequence of the discovery of mines. With regard to these mines, it is said that the Colonial Office has created great dissatisfaction in the colony by reserving a royalty of one-fifth of their gross produce. The house is probably not aware that almost every year the Colonial Office makes some change in the management of the waste lands of the Australian colonies, which affects to a greater or less extent the value of all landed property in those colonies. For instance, with reference to minerals. Originally all minerals were reserved to the Crown, and only the surface of the soil was conveyed to the purchaser. In one instance, however, Lord Bathurst, when Secretary of State for the Colonies, gave all the coal in New South Wales to one company. In consequence of these reservations, no one had any interest in searching for or in discovering mines, therefore no mines were discovered, or if discovered they were carefully concealed. When, however, the noble lord the member for the city of London became Secretary of State for the Colonies, he, with his usual good sense, at once perceived the impolicy of such reservations, and under his rule all minerals were conveyed to the purchaser of the soil. Then mines were discovered, especially in South Australia; and then, to the astonishment of most persons, the Colonial Office determined upon reserving a royalty upon all future mines.

Mr. Hawes: No, no.

Sir William Molesworth: What! Do you mean to say you have never reserved the royalties?

Mr. Hawes: I mean to say the last Colonial Government did.

Sir William Molesworth: The consequence is that the previously-discovered mines, which are nearer the coast, and therefore can be worked with less expense, will have to pay nothing, whilst the subsequently discovered mines, which are further from the coast, and therefore more expensive to work, will have to pay a royalty of 6 per cent. on their gross produce. Such a measure is bad on economical grounds, and bad also in policy. For a policy requires that this country should interfere as little as possible in the internal affairs of its colonies, and above all, as little as possible with their pockets. The noble lord's (the member for the city of London) notion was the right and statesmanlike one—sell your land to the colonists and have done with it. Seigniories and royalties are relics of feudalism, wholly unsuited to the colonies. Their establishment is another instance of the utter ignorance of men and things which the Colonial Office generally displays in its administration of the colonies; and, to crown the absurdity, the emigration commissioners report that their royalties are not worth collecting at present in South Australia. Swan River, *alias* Western Australia, has a delicious climate, much good land, plenty of coal, and is well situated for commerce; it might have proved a flourishing colony by this time, but it was over laid at its birth by the Colonial Office. Its expenditure exceeds its income, and we have to pay seven or eight thousand pounds a year for its civil government. Lastly, New Zealand. I do not know the rate of expenditure per head of the population of that colony. Its expenditure, however, far exceeds its income. We annually vote between twenty and thirty thousand pounds a year for its civil government, exclusive of the bill which we shall have to pay for Maori wars. In the course of the last two years we have voted that £235,000 are to be lent to the New Zealand Company, which I hope will be repaid some day or other. In that colony—what with imbecile governors in the beginning, what with incendiary bishops at present—what with constitutions proclaimed and suspended—what with quarrels with the natives—what with missionaries and land sharks, there has been a state of the most extraordinary confusion. Yet, I believe, through the indomitable energy of our race, New Zealand will ultimately become a flourishing colony—the Britain of the southern sea. The house may remember, that in 1846 the Colonial Office imagined a nondescript constitution for New Zealand, and sent it off post haste to that colony. It was to divide New Zealand into two provinces—New Ulster and New Munster. Each was to have a representative assembly. When the constitution arrived, Governor Grey refused to bestow it on New Ulster, on the grounds that it would enable the British population to legislate for and tax the Maori population. Therefore Governor Grey suspended the constitution of New Ulster, still he could receive further instructions; but he expressed his opinions in very strong terms that the inhabitants of New Munster were fit for a constitution. When this intelligence reached the Colonial Office, Lord Grey immediately proposed to Parliament a bill (which was passed about three or four months ago) to suspend the constitution of both provinces. Now I infer, from later accounts from the colony, that New Munster has obtained its constitution, and perhaps its representative will be assembled, and will be hard at work legislating, when orders will arrive from England to suspend their constitution and to dandle them with ignominy. A curious farce is the history of the management of this colony by the Colonial Office. This same nondescript New Zealand constitution was sent by the Colonial Office to New South Wales for the colonists to inspect, and to see how they would like a similar one. They have rejected it with scorn and contempt. I am afraid, too, that the present Secretary of State for the Colonies, notwithstanding his very great abilities, will not be renowned in future history as either the Solon or Lycurgus of Australia (hear, hear.)

I think I have sufficiently established my position that, in every portion of the globe, the British colonies are more economically and better governed in proportion as they are self-governed. In North America the various States of the Union govern themselves twenty-five per cent. cheaper than the Colonies do, which are to a certain extent under the control of the Colonial Office. (Hear.) In the West Indies the Crown colonies, which are governed by the Colonial Office, are twice as heavily taxed as the plantations; and in Australia, and in the Mediterranean, the same rule holds good. (Hear, hear.) These facts justify the conclusion at which I now arrive, that the greater the amount of local self-government, and the less the Colonial-office interferes in the internal affairs of the colonies, the more economically and the better the colonies will be governed. (Hear.) In the course of the last ten years petitions complaining of Colonial-office government, and praying for representative government, have been presented from the Cape of Good Hope, New South Wales, Van Diemen's Land, Western Australia, South Australia, New Zealand, British Guiana, Trinidad, St. Lucia, and Malta. I presented one to-night myself. The prayer of only one of these petitions has been acceded to. New South Wales has obtained a mongrel form of representative government, which must soon be amended, though not in the fashion proposed by the Colonial Office. (Hear, hear.) All the other petitions have been rejected. Now, I do not assert that each of these colonies would derive the same amount of benefit from free institutions, but I am prepared to maintain that with representative government every one of them, not excepting the Mauritius, would have been more economically and better governed than they have been or are governed by the Colonial Office (Hear.) In saying this I do not mean to speak with disrespect either of past or present Secretaries of State for the Colonies; there is no essential difference between them (hear, hear)—the system is throughout the same, whoever may be the nominal chief (hear, hear); of that system, however, I do intend to speak with respect (hear), and I can quote in justification of my so doing some high authorities on this side of the house, who have carefully studied the subject. I mean my honorable friend the member for Liskeard (Mr. C. Buller), the honorable gentleman the member for Sheffield, and the noble earl at the head of the Colonial Office, before he became Secretary of State for the Colonies. As long as that system exists the majority of the colonies must be ill-governed and their inhabitants discontented; for the Colonial Office undertakes to perform an impossible task. It undertakes the administration, civil, military, financial, judicial, and ecclesiastical of some forty different communities, with various institutions, languages, laws, customs, wants, and interests. It undertakes to legislate more or less for the colonies, and altogether for those which have no representative assemblies. It would be difficult enough to discharge all these functions in a single office, if all the colonies were close together and close to England, but they are scattered over the surface of the globe from the Arctic to the Antarctic pole. To most of them several months must elapse before an answer to a letter can be received, before a petition can be complied with, or a grievance redressed (hear, hear). Therefore, orders which are issued from the Colonial Office in accordance with the last advice from a colony are, in innumerable instances, wholly unsuited to the state of the colony when the orders arrive; in some cases, questions which have been settled are reopened, forgotten disputes revived, and the tardy interference of the Colonial Office is felt to be a curse even when a wrong is redressed. In other cases, the instructions of the Colonial Office are wisely disregarded by the government of the colony, with derision by the colonial assemblies, who marvel at the gross ignorance of their transatlantic rulers (hear, hear). In addition to its other arduous functions, the Colonial Office is required to assist in the slave-trade of Africa; and it has likewise the difficult task of administering a secondary punishment in a penal colony at the antipodes (hear, hear). Now if it were possible for any mortal man to discharge the duties of such an office, it is evident that he ought to possess, not merely great mental powers, but a long and intimate acquaintance with the affairs of the different colonies, and of the more important colonies, and to acquire the first rudiments of colonial lore, they were succeeded by some other statesman, who had to commence his lessons as Secretary of State for the Colonies, and to try to govern the despotic and irresponsible government of some score or so of dependent states. (Hear, hear.) In fact the colonial government of this country is an ever-changing, frequently well-intentioned, but invariably weak and ignorant despotism. Its policy varies incessantly, swayed about by opposite influences; at one time directed, perhaps, by the West India body, the next instant by the Anti-Slavery Society, then by Canadian merchants, or by a New Zealand Company, or by a Missionary Society: it is everything by turns, and nothing long; Saint, Protectionist, Free-trader, in rapid succession; one day it originates a project, the next day it abandons it, therefore all its schemes are abortive, and all its measures are un-

successful (hear, hear.) Witness the economical condition of the West Indies, the frontier relations of the Cape of Good Hope, the immoral state of Van Diemen's Land (hear, hear), and the pseudo-systematic colonization and revoked constitution of New Zealand (hear, hear). Such a Government might suit savages and other barbarians; but to men of our race—intelligent and energetic Englishmen accustomed to freedom and to local self-government, it is one of the most hateful and odious Governments that can well be imagined. It is difficult to express the deep-seated hatred and contempt which is felt for the Colonial Office by almost every dependency subject to its sway. (Hear, hear.) If you doubt this fact, put the question to the West Indies and the Mauritius; put the same question to Van Diemen's Land, to New South Wales, to New Zealand, and your other Australian colonies; from all of them you will receive the same answer, and the same prayer: to be freed from the control of the Colonial Office (Hear, hear). Even the Colonies are not content, though they have responsible government; and though, in most respects, they are virtually independent of the Colonial Office; yet every now and then the Colonial Office contrives to produce irritation by stupid interference (hear, hear) in some question of minor importance, such as the regulations of a banking bill, or the amount of a petty salary. (Hear, hear.) Though the colonies have ample reason to complain of the manner in which their affairs are administered by the Colonial Office of this country, they have still greater reason to complain of the governors and other functionaries who are sent by the Colonial Office to the colonies; for, generally speaking, they are chosen, not on account of any special aptitude for, or knowledge of, the business which they will have to perform, but for reasons foreign to the interests of the colonies. For instance, poor relations or needy dependents of men having political influence (hear, hear), officers in the army or navy who have been unsuccessful in their professions (hear, hear), briefless barristers, electioneering agents, idle idlers, applicants for public employment, whose employment in this country public opinion would forbid (hear, hear), and at times even disreputable partisans whom it is expedient to get rid of in the colonies (hear, hear); these are the materials out of which the Colonial Office has too frequently manufactured its governors and other functionaries. Therefore, in most cases they are equally unfit for the duties which they have to perform, and being wholly ignorant of the affairs of the colony to which they are appointed, they become the tools of one or other of the colonial factions; whence perpetual jealousies and never-ending feuds (hear, hear). The governors, the judges, and the other high functionaries are generally on hostile terms. The governors remove the judges, the judges appeal to us for redress; every one has a pet to whom he is inclined to refer the consideration of Parliament. To settle such questions the Colonial Office has just created a new tribunal, composed of an ex-Indian judge and railway commissioner, and of an ex-Secretary of the Colonies (hear, hear); the one with little knowledge of colonial affairs, the other famed for years as the real head of the colony, and the system and the three wretched members of the colonies. It would be easy to cite instances which have occurred during the last ten years which would illustrate every one of these positions. I forbear, however, to do so, because the facts are notorious to every one who has taken any interest in colonial affairs. It is no wonder that the colonies are discontented, and that they are badly and expensively governed. Is there no remedy for this state of things? I have traced the evil to its source in the colonial system of the Colonial Office. Can that system be amended? I doubt it (hear, hear). It appears to me that the Colonial Office as an instrument for governing the colonies must always be far inferior to any mode of self-government by the colonists, for it is evident that at least in ninety-nine cases out of every hundred, the interests of the colonies are better judged of by their own interests than by honorable gentlemen far away in Downing-street can possibly be. It is evident, likewise, that (though the empire at large has a deep interest in the good and economical government of the colonies—though all of us here present are most sincerely desirous that the colonies should be contented and happy), yet we have other things to be done, and that the Colonial Office is not the best body for studying colonial affairs and looking after the Colonial Office. Therefore, the Colonial Office is virtually irresponsible; it may play what pranks it pleases; it is only when we have to pay for a Canadian insanity, or for a Kafir war, that an outcry is raised, and the Colonial Office is called to account, and then there is not above a score of us who know anything about the subject, even after a laborious study of the documents carefully prepared for the purpose by the Colonial Office (loud cheers). Remember, likewise, that implicit reliance cannot be placed on mere documents (hear, hear). Some, for instance, are long dilatory despatches, written for the sole purpose of being presented to Parliament, not intended to produce any specific results in the colonies; but full of well-turned periods, containing lofty sentiments and apparently statesmanlike views, calculated to gain credit for the office, and to satisfy the minds of honorable, ignorant, and confiding members, who soon afterwards forget all about the matter (hear, hear). Again, as a collection of materials for enabling the house to form a judgment with regard to colonial affairs, those documents are not to be trusted, for, generally speaking, they are tainted with partiality, and necessarily so; because they were selected out of a vast mass, on account of their supposed importance; of that importance the Colonial Office is the sole and irresponsible judge; it determines without appeal what shall be produced and what shall be suppressed; in so doing, it must obey the unchanging laws of human nature, and attach greater importance to those documents which commend themselves to its opinions; the former, therefore, obtain its special care, and are sure to be produced; the latter are comparatively neglected, and liable to be forgotten and suppressed; the result is inevitable, namely, partial statements (hear, hear)—instances of human fallibility, but affording, however, incontestable proofs of the impossibility under

which this house labours of forming a correct judgment with regard to colonial affairs. For similar reasons the Colonial-office labours under a similar difficulty, because the statements made to it by the colonial authorities must frequently be of a partial character, and at times wholly untrustworthy; yet always months and sometimes whole years elapse before any explanation of those statements can be obtained. (Hear.) Therefore ignorance and irresponsibility are the characteristic defects of our present mode of governing the colonies. For these defects there is no remedy but local self-government. Hence I come to the conclusion that we should delegate to the colonies all powers of local legislation and administration which are now possessed by the Colonial Office, with the reservation only of those powers, the exercise of which would be absolutely inconsistent with the sovereignty of this country, or might be directly injurious to the interests of the whole empire. It appears to me that the powers that ought to be reserved are few in number and could easily be defined. To determine them it would be necessary merely to consider what are the benefits which this country may derive from the colonies, and what are the duties which the continuous enjoyment of those benefits. Now colonies are useful either as affording markets for our produce or outlets for our population. To prove their utility as markets my honorable friend the member for Liskeard, in his most able and admirable speech in 1843, on systematic colonization, showed that the rate of consumption of British produce and manufactures, per head of the population, was very much greater in colonies than in other countries. Of the correctness of this position there can be no doubt. In 1844 continental Europe, with a population of about 220 millions of inhabitants, did not consume more than 24 millions of pounds worth of our produce and manufactures; whilst our colonies (including the United States), with a population not exceeding 25 millions, consumed 16 millions of pounds worth of our goods. Therefore, the rate of consumption of our goods did not exceed 2s. 2d. a head in continental Europe, it amounted to 8s. a head in the United States, and £1 2s. a head in our other colonies. It must, however, be admitted that a considerable portion of our trade with our subject colonies consists of goods sent to defray the cost of our establishments there; making, however, every fair calculation on that account, still it cannot be denied that they are excellent markets for our goods; it is very unfortunate, therefore, that they cost us so much as 16s. a head for their population for government and defence, as that sum must absorb the greater portion of, if not all, the profit of our trade with those colonies. To show the utility of colonies as outlets for our population, I may refer to the reports of the emigration commissioners, which it is not necessary to repeat in detail. In the last twenty years, 1,672,803 persons have emigrated from this country, of whom 825,564 went to the United States, 702,181 to the North American colonies, 127,185 to the Australian colonies, and 19,000 to other places. It would be interesting to know what has been the cost of this emigration, and how it has been defrayed. I can only put it at least at £20,000,000 sterling, which about £1,500,000 were paid out of the proceeds of land sales in the Australian colonies. This emigration has varied considerably in amount from year to year—from the minimum of 25,000 in 1828, to the maximum of 258,270 persons last year. If averages of five years be taken, it appears to have gone on steadily increasing in amount; for on the average of the five years ending with 1832, it amounted to 60,000 persons a year; ending with 1837, to 66,000 persons a year; ending with 1842, to 85,000 persons a year; and ending with 1847, to 121,000 persons a year. That the habit of emigrating is confirmed, and becoming more powerful every day; and, therefore, colonies are becoming more useful as outlets for our population. Therefore, free trade with the colonies is a most desirable thing, and the administration which are not absolutely inconsistent with these objects and with the sovereignty of this country, I believe that our colonial expenditure might be greatly diminished in amount, and that our colonial empire would flourish and become of incalculable utility to this country. I do not propose to abandon any portion of that empire. I only complain that it is so little use to us that it is a vast tract of fertile desert, which costs us £4,000,000 sterling a year, and yet only contains a million and a half of our race. Would it not be possible to people this desert with active and thriving Englishmen—to cover it with communities composed of men with wants, habits, and feelings similar to our own, anxious to carry on with us a mutual beneficial trade? In this country every trade, every profession, and every branch of industry are overstocked; in every quarter there is a fierce competition for employment. On the contrary, in the colonies, there is an equally fierce competition for labour of every kind. Now, is there any mode of bridging over the oceans that intervene, so that our colonies may be to the United Kingdom what the backwoods are to the United States? If such a plan could be devised—if it could be carried into execution—it might tend to solve the most difficult economical problems of England and of Ireland. To carry such a plan into execution, two things would be requisite. First, funds wherewith to convey the poorer classes to the colonies. How could such funds be obtained? The hon. gentleman the member for Salford, the hon. gentleman the member for Gateshead, and my hon. friend the member for Liskeard have, in their numerous and able speeches upon this subject, told us that sufficient funds could be obtained by the sale of waste lands, according to the well-known plan of Mr. Wakefield. I hold the same opinion. I firmly believe that with continuous and systematic emigration, sufficient funds could be so obtained. But I will suppose, for the sake of argument, that they must be obtained, for the present, from some other source. Now, I ask the house to consider, first, that we spend four million

sterling a year in the colonies on army, navy, ordnance, commissariat, Kafir wars, Canadian rebellions, and the like; secondly, that for half four millions (the sum which I propose to save by a reduction of colonial expenditure) we might send annually to Australia 150,000 persons, and to Canada twice that number, I ask the house, at the expiration of ten or fifteen years, from which of these two modes of expending the public money would the nation derive the greater benefit? Our army, navy, and ordnance cost us at present from six to seven millions sterling a year more than they did in 1835. A third part of it (the two millions a year which I affirm can be spared from our colonial expenditure) would have been sufficient in ten years to double or triple the British population of our colonial empire. For instance, the sum would in ten years have conveyed a million and a half of our fellow-citizens to Australia; where the climate is so peculiarly suited to our race, where abundance of food can easily be obtained; there, flourishing and contented, they would have been anxious to purchase our produce and manufactures; wealthy states, worthy of the British name, would have been generated, carrying on with us an enormous trade; self-governed they would have needed neither navy nor army to protect them, and would have gladly defrayed every local expense. That would have been a colonial empire to boast about. Again, the same sum of two millions sterling a year would, in ten years, have conveyed to North America some three millions—say, of Irishmen. With that sum I believe you might have created beyond the Atlantic a new and happy Ireland, so attractive to the Celtic race that they would have migrated in shoals from the old and unhappy Ireland, and thus, perhaps, have enabled you to solve that fearful problem which neither gagging bills, nor coercion bills, nor even a powerful navy of the union will ever solve. That would have been a feat for a great statesman to accomplish, and would have covered his name with immortal renown. I do grudge the four millions a year which we squander upon our colonies, when I consider what might be done with half that sum for the benefit of this country, and of the colonies, by means of systematic colonization. But to colonize beneficially it is necessary that the higher and richer, as well as the poorer classes—that the employers of labour as well as the employed—that all classes of society should migrate together, forming new communities, analogous to that of the parent state. On such principles alone have successful colonies been founded in ancient or modern times. On such principles the colonies of Greece and of New England were founded. For instance, from the overcrowded cities of Greece the colonists departed under the guidance of their foremost men; they carried along with them the images of their heroes and of their gods, whose common worship linked them ever to their ancient home. Arrived at their destination, they formed states after the model of the parent city; they flourished in wealth, excelled in all the arts of civilized life, extended the empire, and Australia, and New Zealand, anxiously expect our arrival to convert their wastes into happy abodes of the Anglo-Saxon race. In making these observations I wish merely to show that if vast sums of money are to be expended on the colonies, they can be expended in a manner far more beneficial to the interests both of the colonies and of the rest of the empire than they have been hitherto expended. I do not, however, intend to propose to the house any plan of systematic colonization, or any grant of public money for that purpose. My only objects, at present, are reduction of useless expenditure, and reform of bad colonial government. But I will presume to express my belief that there is a great and noble career open for any statesman who, possessing the power, shall, with firm and vigorous determination, curtail that expenditure, reform that system of government, and, at the same time, promote systematic colonization. In what manner colonial expenditure can be curtailed without detriment to the interests of the empire—in what manner the system of colonial government can be amended for the benefit of the colonies—I have attempted to show; and in the hope that I have succeeded in proving that that expenditure ought to be curtailed, and that system of government ought to be amended, I take the liberty of moving the resolution: "That it is the opinion of this house that the colonial expenditure of the British empire demands inquiry, with a view to its reduction; and that to accomplish this reduction, and to secure greater contentment and prosperity to the colonists, they ought to be invested with large powers for the administration of their local affairs." And if the government will accede to this motion, I give notice that next session I shall follow up this subject, by moving for a committee of inquiry. (Cheers.)

Printed and Published by CHARLES KEMP and JOHN FAIRFAX, at the Morning Herald Printing Office, Lower George-street, Sydney, New South Wales, Saturday, November 15, 1868.